

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

		•	•	ℓ
APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/695,755	10/24/2000	Michael A. Nelson	CROSS1400-1	2697
44654 SPRINKLE IP	7590 06/13/2007 LAW GROUP	EXAMINER		
1301 W. 25TH STREET SUITE 408 AUSTIN, TX 78705			RYMAN, DANIEL J	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
•			2616	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
. •			06/13/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	·	Application No.	Applicant(s)
		09/695,755	NELSON ET AL.
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
		Daniel J. Ryman	2616
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication apor or Reply	pears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence address
WHIC - Exte after - If NC - Failu Any	CORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLICATION OF THE MAILING INSTRUCTION OF THE	DATE OF THIS COMMUNION 136(a). In no event, however, may a red will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON te, cause the application to become AE	CATION. reply be timely filed ITHS from the mailing date of this communication. BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		•	
1) 又	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 I	March 2007.	• •
2a)□		is action is non-final.	
3)	Since this application is in condition for allowa	ance except for formal matt	ters, prosecution as to the merits is
	closed in accordance with the practice under	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D.). 11, 453 O.G. 213.
Disposit	ion of Claims		
4) 🖂	Claim(s) 4,5,8,11 and 15-18 is/are pending in	the application.	
,	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra	• •	
5)⊠	Claim(s) 4,5 and 8 is/are allowed.		,
·	Claim(s) 11 and 18 is/are rejected.		·
	Claim(s) <u>15-17</u> is/are objected to.		
8)	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/	or election requirement.	
Applicat	ion Papers	•	
9)	The specification is objected to by the Examin	ner.	
	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ac		by the Examiner.
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the		·
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the corre	ction is required if the drawing	(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11)	The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	Examiner. Note the attached	d Office Action or form PTO-152.
Priority (under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreig		§ 119(a)-(d) or (f).
	1. Certified copies of the priority documer		
	2. Certified copies of the priority documer		··
	 Copies of the certified copies of the pri- application from the International Burea 	•	received in this National Stage
* 9	See the attached detailed Office action for a lis	` ' ' ' ' ' ' ' ' ' ' ' ' ' ' ' ' ' ' '	received
			Toodiveu.
Attachmer	nt(s)		
	ce of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview S	Summary (PTO-413)
2) Notice No	ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) rmation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) er No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No(s)/Mail Date nformal Patent Application

Art Unit: 2616

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. The indicated allowability of claims 11 and 18 is withdrawn in view of the newly discovered reference(s) to Vaidya et al. (USPN 6,870,809) and Deng et al. (USPN 6,567,414). Rejections based on the newly cited reference(s) follow.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Epps et al. (USPN 6,731,644), of record, in view of Muller et al. (USPN 6,128,666), of record, in further view of Vaidya et al. (USPN 6,870,809).
- 4. Regarding claim 11, Epps discloses a frame buffer system comprising: a receive buffer configured to store a plurality of received frames (ref. 215, see col. 5, lines 43-48), wherein the receive buffer is configured to be accessed in a first-in-first-out fashion (col. 8, lines 29-34, see also col. 5, lines 43-60); a header storage configured to store header information corresponding to each of the frames in the receive buffer (ref. 480, see col. 9, lines 34-41); transfer logic coupled to the receive buffer and header storage, wherein the transfer logic is configured to make a routing decision for delivering each of the frames in the receive buffer to a destination based on the corresponding header information read from the header storage (col. 9, lines 1-15), the routing decision being made prior to the corresponding frame reaching a head position in the

Art Unit: 2616

receive buffer (col. 9, lines 1-22, where the routing decision is made in an intermediate stage of the pipeline process, i.e. the TLU stage, and where the packet is transferred once it has reached the final pipeline stage, see also col. 6, lines 36-42), and to transmit each of the frames to a destination port according to the corresponding routing decision (col. 9, lines 11-22, where the "frame" is retrieved from the receive buffer and sent to a transmit buffer, see also col. 3, lines 22-34).

Epps does not expressly disclose that the header information is duplicated header information. Rather, Epps discloses that the header information is stripped from the received packet, such that a joining circuit must rejoin the header and the payload when the packet is ready to be transmitted (col. 7, lines 5-10). Muller teaches, in a system for examining packet headers, copying the packet headers and forwarding these copies to a search engine (col. 6, line 67-col. 6, line 17, where the search engine determines how the packet is to be routed). Muller copies rather than extracts the header in order to modify or update header information only when necessary to preserve end-to-end error robustness (col. 5, lines 44-55). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to duplicate the header information, rather than extract the header information, in order to preserve end-to-end error robustness by modifying or updating the header information only when necessary.

Epps in view of Muller does not expressly disclose a bypass circuit configured to receive first duplicated header information, wherein when duplicated header information is received, if no preceding duplicated header information is currently stored in the header storage, the bypass circuit is configured to make the first duplicated header information available to transfer logic. Vaidya teaches, in a FIFO packet buffering system, that when a buffer is empty then received

Art Unit: 2616

information will be transferred directly out of the buffer (col. 9, lines 17-23). It is implicit that this is done to eliminate any delay that would be incurred by forcing information to cycle through an empty buffer. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to employ of the processing technique of Vaidya in the system of Epps in view of Muller by configuring a bypass circuit to receive first duplicated header information, wherein when duplicated header information is received, if no preceding duplicated header information is currently stored in the header storage, the bypass circuit is configured to make the first duplicated header information available to transfer logic. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated to do this to eliminate any delay that would be incurred by having a newly received packet cycle through an empty buffer.

- 5. Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Epps et al. (USPN 6,731,644), of record, in view of Muller et al. (USPN 6,128,666), of record, in further view of Vaidya et al. (USPN 6,870,809), as applied to claims 1 and 9 above, and in further view of Deng et al. (USPN 6,567,414).
- 6. Regarding claim 18, Epps in view of Muller in further view of Vaidya does not expressly disclose a transmit timer associated with the transmit buffer, wherein the transmit timer indicates the amount of time the frame currently residing in the transmit buffer has been in the transmit buffer. Deng teaches, in a packet communication system, associating a transmit timer with a buffer to ensure that a buffer does not become blocked for a long period of time (col. 2, lines 41-46). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the buffer timer of Deng with the system of Epps in view of Muller in further view of Vaidya to have a system that associates a transmit timer with the transmit buffer,

Application/Control Number: 09/695,755 Page 5

Art Unit: 2616

wherein the transmit timer indicates the amount of time the frame currently residing in the transmit buffer has been in the transmit buffer. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated to do this to ensure that the transmit buffer does not become blocked by a packet for a long period of time.

Allowable Subject Matter

- 7. Claims 4, 5, and 8 are allowed. The prior art does not disclose or fairly suggest tying a specific timer to each header in the header buffer to indicate the amount of time that a frame has been in the buffer.
- 8. Claims 15-17 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. The prior art does not disclose or fairly suggest tying a specific timer to each header in the header buffer to indicate the amount of time that a frame has been in the buffer.

Conclusion

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Nichols et al. (US 4,977,582) and Sang et al. (US 6,577,636) disclose routing/forwarding systems that include storing frame header information.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Daniel J. Ryman whose telephone number is (571)272-3152. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Fri. 8:00am-4:30pm.

Application/Control Number: 09/695,755

Art Unit: 2616

Page 6

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Huy Vu can be reached on (571)272-3155. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Daniel J. Ryman Examiner Art Unit 2616

Danul Brown